

COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION/INFORMATION SYSTEMS

February 4, 2003

5:30 PM

Chairman Gatsas called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Gatsas, Guinta, Osborne, Forest

Absent: Alderman O'Neil

Messrs: D. Prew, S. Sayward, J. Angell

Chairman Gatsas addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Service Agreement between the City of Manchester and Verizon New England, Inc.

Alderman Forest moved the item for discussion. Alderman Osborne duly seconded the motion.

Ms. Prew stated what I am presenting to you this afternoon is a five-year contract for telephone dial tone. The City telephone service falls into three categories. We have dial tone service, which is currently provided by Verizon. We have in state long-distance, which is currently also being provided by Verizon and then we have out-of-state long-distance, which is provided by Paytech Communications. It is the dial tone portion of the service that expires on February 18. We are recommending a five-year Centrex contract with Verizon and this includes the School Department. We would be purchasing under a State contract. The State put out an extensive RFP and did extensive research over a long period of time. We are recommending that we go with that contract. The advantages to the City are that it is the least expensive solution for dial tone. It allows the same type of service to all locations and the City has telephone service to approximately 85 different buildings. We are a priority customer with Verizon for repairs, which means when we have problems we get very prompt service. Verizon has been very responsive to us in the past. We also have access to their switch, which means that we can make changes to how the telephone system is structured without having to go through Verizon. It saves money because each time you make a request there is a charge attached to that and it also allows us to provide a higher level of service to our departments. If there is an emergency and a

department needs to move from its current location we can have all of those telephone numbers forwarded to another location automatically. The terms of the contract are that we would be paying \$21.40/line/month. That includes unlimited local calling. Some of the major features include four-digit dialing between the departments. It allows for transfer of calls between departments. It allows for call forwarding, three-way conferencing and as I said access to the switch and a whole list of additional features that I could go through if you so desired. Our current configuration is that we have 722 lines - 290 of these belong to the School Department; 173 of these belong to the Enterprises, such as Airport, Water and EPD; and 259 lines belong to City departments. As I said we are in approximately 85 locations within the City. I think a thing that is important to remember here is that not all of these telephone lines are being used for voice communication. They are also being used for computer connections. They are used for equipment and security that is being monitored in various buildings, particularly the School buildings. They are used in elevators. They are used for credit card payment. They are used to remotely program traffic lights. The use of the telephone lines is very diverse and just to give you an example in our department we have 20 telephone lines. We use six of them for voice. We use two of them for fax and one of those fax lines is for a network fax that all departments can access. We have four for remote paging for Police and Fire. We have one dedicated line, which allows IBM to monitor our equipment for equipment failures. We have a dedicated dial out line for file transfers when we transfer information to the bank or to the credit unions or to some of the insurance companies – whoever we need to provide information to. We have six ISDN circuits, which are used for communications between departments. The new contract charges would be approximately \$17,300/month. It is about \$1,070 a month more than the current contract.

Chairman Gatsas stated I assume that there are some chargebacks to schools and the City is not picking up that cost.

Ms. Prew replied what happens with the telephone bill is it comes in in a magnetic format and we break the telephone bill down with software that we have and we distribute that to all of the departments. Each department is responsible for paying their own telephone bill.

Chairman Gatsas asked how many more lines do we have in place now than we had three years ago.

Ms. Prew answered 26 lines.

Chairman Gatsas asked 26 more than we had three years ago.

Ms. Prew answered yes.

Chairman Gatsas asked this is a three-year contract I presume.

Ms. Prew replied this is a five-year contract. Actually the last time we spoke in 2000 we had 696 lines. We now have 722 lines.

Alderman Forest asked do you know where these lines are.

Ms. Prew replied yes. We know where every line is.

Alderman Forest stated the reason I ask is that on Dunbarton Road there are three listed here. Now I assume that one of them is the dog pound and the other one is the facility at the drop-off place but the third one has an address of 657 Dunbarton Road. That is the old address for the building that used to be at the dump. Is there any reason why that line is still there?

Ms. Sayward replied I was at the Recycling Center today. They have a fax line, a phone line and then the dog pound.

Alderman Forest stated it is listed at an address which would be across the street from the dog pound and there is nothing there. There is the animal shelter and then the recycling drop-off area, which are the 500 and the 496 Dunbarton Road. 657 Dunbarton Road would be across the street because it is an odd number so that would put it in the dump that is closed. That is why I am asking why there is a line in there.

Ms. Prew replied we can check on that.

Ms. Angell asked when did it close. Did it close during our contract?

Alderman Forest stated it closed four or five years ago.

Ms. Angell replied it closed during this contract period. It is an active line but their records may not have caught that it actually moved across the street. It was probably a very minor move for them.

Alderman Forest stated I have a similar question with Main Street. You have one at 76 Main Street, which I assume is the library and then you have one at 121 Main Street, which would be across the street. Is this for a traffic light or for the new building at the sports complex?

Ms. Sayward replied it would be for the sports complex.

Alderman Osborne stated the difference between the last contract and this contract here – the last contract was three year's right.

Ms. Prew replied seven years.

Alderman Osborne asked so the last contract was seven years and this one is a five-year.

Ms. Prew answered yes.

Alderman Osborne asked what is the advantage or disadvantage of going from seven years to five years.

Ms. Prew answered the State contract under which we are purchasing is a five-year contract.

On motion of Alderman Forest, duly seconded by Alderman Osborne, it was voted to approve the service agreement.

Chairman Gatsas addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Communication from Ronald E. Ludwig, Director of Parks, Recreation and Cemeteries requesting waiver of a fair license fee for the City's Independence Day Celebration at Arms Park on Thursday, July 3, 2003 with a rain date of Saturday, July 5, 2003.

On motion of Alderman Guinta, duly seconded by Alderman Forest, it was voted to waive the fair license fee for the City's Independence Day Celebration at Arms Park on Thursday, July 3, 2003 with a rain date of Saturday, July 5, 2003.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated I am not sure if that fair license fee is allowed a waiver or not. In the event it isn't, then it would be a payment for civic contributions or something and it is going to come back to the general fund anyway because it just comes back into the City Clerk's budget. That is what we have had to do for non-profit agencies like the Boy's Club.

Chairman Gatsas asked so what you are saying is charging the fee from the City side and then taking it back.

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied it may end up being one to the other and when we submit the report to the Board I just want you aware...I mean the intentions of the

Committee will be honored obviously but it may come out worded a little differently in order to get it done.

TABLED ITEM

5. Request of Mayor Baines that the Committee act on the Bag and Tag Proposal.

This item remained on the table.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Guinta, duly seconded by Alderman Forest, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee